REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 8, and 29-30. Support for the amendments may be found in paragraphs [0083] – [0084]. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-50 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-8, 12-37 and 41-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ala-Laurila (US 6,246,871). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims.

Claims 1-8, 12-37 and 41-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ala-Laurila (US Patent No. 6,246,871). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and has further amended the claims to more distinctly and clearly claim the subject matter which Applicant believes as his invention. A favorable reconsideration is requested.

The present invention, as disclosed and claimed, deals with providing storage facility (outbox) to a subscriber that can be managed and controlled by the subscriber to make messages in the mailbox available for a non-subscriber. This enables the subscriber, during a telephone call, for instance, to store messages intended for the addressed party and provide access to these messages even though the system used by the sender normally would not allow other than the sender to access the mailbox (or, "storage facility" in claim 1). This storage facility, or "outbox", is available to access by the subscriber to modify or delete stored messages (including fax, e-mail, video mail, voice mail). The term "outbox" is used to distinguish from an inbox, used by a "receiver" for receiving messages; where the Applicant's "outbox" is used for storing outgoing messages that were not accepted by an intended receiver at the intended receiver's inbox.

The present invention utilizes a monitoring function, connected to the outbox, that is controllable by, and likely paid for by, the calling party (sender) (the Applicant's

previous response, to the Non Final, includes diagrams of the Applicant's invention for comparison to the cited art). The system provides voicemail access over the telephone network, indicating message number, etc. with the ability to play messages to the telephone user. For text type messages, such as facsimile and e-mail, the system converts the text into speech and plays the speech to the telephone user. The system allows a personal computer user to obtain the data network access using an Internet browser. The browser is used to access information about the messages stored and is used to download and play the messages via data streaming in the case of a voice or video messages or view the messages in the case of text type messages, such as facsimile and e-mail. The user can also perform the other typical messaging functions over the data network connection that are provided for telephone access, such as saving and deleting messages, group list administration and other administration tasks.

The Applicant compared the construction of the Applicant's present invention and the AlaLaurila and Eason references by illustration in the previous response in order to show the differences that are disclosed by the Applicant's invention. The figures depict a high level illustration of the present invention where a sender sends a message, of one of the types noted in the claims, to an outbox (storage facility) that belongs to the Sender. The "outbox" allows the receiver to still get the message by accessing the sender's outbox – by permission of the sender. The reason that the message goes to the sender's storage facility could be a full inbox of the receiver or no answer, or the message could be too big for the receiver's inbox.

A monitoring function detects when the message is sent, where the message is addressed and causes an alert (type chosen by the sender) that identifies the sender's outbox facility (unique URL) by sending the outbox URL to the receiver. The receiver can then connect to the sender's outbox and provide authentication after which the message is provided to the receiver.

As depicted in the drawings in the previous response, both the AlaLaurila and Eason references use inboxes; in the case of AlaLaurila, the sender's (A) own inbox. The inboxes of the cited art are standard inboxes each belonging to the sender or the receiver. Monitoring is done only at the local exchange of the receiver in the AlaLaurila reference as it is in the Eason reference.

The Applicant's configuration discloses the use of an "outbox" that is assigned to and used exclusively by the sender; the outbox is not disclosed in the AlaLaurila reference. The present invention monitors sender actions and detects when a message is rerouted to the outbox and to which receiver the message was sent. The URL of the outbox is then sent to the receiver along with access information to the sender's outbox. Both of the cited art references fail to provide a separate outbox that is controlled by the sender and wherein access permission to the outbox is only available from the sender.

The AlaLaurila reference does not disclose the use of an outbox that is the sender's outbox and controlled by the sender both in storing outgoing messages in the outbox, allowing access by authorized receivers and by allowing editing of messages stored in the outbox. Since the normal function of a typical outbox is for holding messages to be sent, allowing a receiver to access the Applicant's outbox is very different from the Ala Laurila inbox cited by the Examiner. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 1, 29 and 30 and the respective dependent claims, 2-8, 12-28, 31-37 and 41-50.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 11, 38 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Eason et al (US Patent No. 6,999,566). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Eason reference is cited for disclosing notifying a sender of a stored message of changes in a status of the stored message since the Ala-Laurila reference fails to disclose this limitation. The Applicant respectfully contends that Eason does not disclose the other limitations missing from the Ala-Laurila reference, that of storing outgoing messages in a sender's Outbox and allowing a receiver access to the Outbox to retrieve or view messages that are authorized by the sender for only the receiver. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 9, 11, 38 and 40 since a combination of the two references does not disclose the missing limitations.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Horvitz (US Publication No. 2004/0254998). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Horvitz reference is cited for disclosing notifying a sender of an alert of changes in a status of the alert since the Ala-Laurila reference fails to disclose this limitation. The Applicant respectfully contends that Horvitz does not disclose at least the other limitations missing from the Ala-Laurila reference, that of storing outgoing messages in a sender's outbox and allowing a receiver access to the outbox to retrieve or view messages that are authorized by the sender for only the receiver. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 10 and 39 since a combination of the two references does not disclose the missing limitations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sidney L. Weatherford/

By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: August 29, 2011

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com